HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 22 Wednesday, June 3, 1959 Washington, D. C.

News Section

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

1960: *Democratic frontrunners fade*.....(page 1)
NEW YORK: *A conservative wins*.....(page 1)
LABOR: *Hoffa knifes Reuther*.....(page 2)
DULLES: *The story that wasn't told*.....(page 3)
SUBVERSION: *A warning from Hoover*.....(page 4)

The Dim Democrats: "You just can't trust the American economy"—so remarked a cynical and dejected Democratic politico on Capitol Hill, as he listened to the GOP Administration recite the figures of rising employment and business—with the prospect of great prosperity in the crucial political year, 1960.

For the health residing in the body of the economy has begun to make itself felt in the halls of Congress. There, four Democratic Senators—Kennedy, Symington, Humphrey and Johnson—with their eyes fixed on the 1960 nomination, have appeared hopeful that the scars of the recession would provide them issues with which to clobber the GOP Administration.

New Dealers thrive upon the fear or existence of a depression. But the economic body has disappointed them with recovery.

Consequently, all four find their pied piper tunes badly falsetto, and it is significant that Stuart Symington, who up till now has received little publicity, is presently being pushed forward. Some friends picture him as a "moderate," as the public mood is chilly towards radicalism. Other friends try to picture "Sanctimonious Stu" as a "conservative," because he is a businessman. But HUMAN EVENTS readers know from his voting record that he is 100% for the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) socialistic line.

Meanwhile, "Little Jack" Kennedy's profile, particularly the chin, looks weaker day by day. He displeased the labor bosses by mishandling the so-called labor reform bill and alienated the American public by trampling on the "bill of rights" measure proposed by crusading Senator John McClellan.

"Redder Than a Rose" Hubert Humphrey can no longer take advantage of an unstable business atmosphere which is fast evaporating with the recovery. The mass of the people had never heard of Humphrey until Khrushchev gave him an interview in Moscow. But everybody is getting a Kremlin audience nowadays, even Nixon, who is slated to see the dictator on his forthcoming visit to Russia.

There remains only Senator Lyndon Johnson, the Democratic leader of the party in the upper house, and his well-illuminated figure now seems to be a bit dim. Reporters on the Hill cannot find out what has happened to Lyndon's great forensic dream of three months ago, when he chose a probe of unemployment as a springboard to greater popularity and launched a proposal for a joint congressional investigation of the problem. Obviously it is scarcely the propaganda tool to wield today. Finally, Lyndon has assumed the role of Pontius Pilate in the fight over the confirmation of Secretary of Commerce Lewis Strauss. Who ever won a Presidential nomination in that kind of toga?

Republican Senators jeer at "Lyndon's Folly," referring to the monster staff and office suites which he has on the Hill. It is reported that he has no less than 20 staffed units, all costing about $700,000. The average Senator spends about $100,000 on his equipment and personnel. Drawn in as advisers are Clark Clifford (who brain trusted Truman), Dean Acheson (foreign affairs), Tommy "The Cork" Corcoran (who brain trusted Roosevelt in the Supreme Court packing fight), and FDR's secretary, Grace Tully; and lots of staff—old technicians from FDR and Truman regimes, popular former newspapermen, New Deal specialists of all sorts. But what—it is asked—has this little army of "brains" been able to do against the euphoria of returning prosperity?

Nevertheless, some shrewd observers believe that Lyndon will be the only member of this ambitious quartet to survive in the Democratic race in 1960. They say that Lyndon's team of experts has kept close relations with Walter Reuther and the latter looks favorably on Johnson, as the other frontrunners fade.

This help could prove decisive, it is claimed, for Reuther's strength in delegates to the Democratic convention is now estimated as between 400 and 500 (out of an estimated 2400 total). In 1956, it was about 300-400. Increased COPE activity (results of which showed in last fall's elections) has lifted his power within the Democratic party. Those who have covered former Democratic conventions believe this bloc of 400-500 can swing any candidate Reuther wants. At present, the betting is on Lyndon Johnson as favorite son of the AFL-CIO.

Victory: The outcome of a special election in New York State, last week, is being widely hailed by conservatives throughout the Nation. In a contest to determine a successor to the late Representative Daniel A. Reed, GOP candidate Charles E. Goodell, Jr., defeated his Democratic opponent by an overwhelming margin.

Reports out of New York say that the youthful Goodell comes to Washington armed with a set of first rate principles—principles with which he will not compromise—as evidenced during his victorious campaign.

While traveling some 14,000 miles throughout New York's 43rd Congressional District, the 33-year-old attorney repeatedly hammered away at the "socialistic trend" in America, which he said includes Federal aid to education, Federal housing and farm support programs.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In his victory statement, Goodell said: "I believe the people of the district have spoken clearly and cleanly for the entire Nation to hear. They want a return to free enterprise farming and gradual elimination, not increase, of price supports. They want restraint upon Federal incursions into new fields which belong in the local domain. They want strong, fair legislation with teeth in it to knock the gangsters out of labor unions and management."

In an on-the-spot radio broadcast from the election district, Fulton Lewis III reported that Congressman Goodell is supporting Vice President Nixon for nomination to the Presidency in 1960.

Education Front: The Nation's press did a poor job of interpreting a report issued by the President's Science Advisory Committee, last week, according to education experts in the Capital.

This 18,000 word report was headlined by many papers as if it advanced one major proposal, to wit: that the annual outlay of the country on education should be doubled, thereby calling for $30 to $40 billion a year. Experts scanning this lengthy document found only one sentence which might be construed this way, and that sentence did not indicate whether this doubling of expenditures should take place in one year or in ten years. If the latter was meant, say experts, "let nature take its course," for figures show that national educational spending has doubled every ten years since 1900.

Why this one, imprecise sentence should have been selected for headlining remains obscure, unless it was that advocates of heavy Federal aid to education drew it to the attention of newsmen. It is certainly misleading, say experts, for most of the report is excellent and in general harmony with the conservative recommendations of Dr. Roger Freeman (see HUMAN EVENTS for May 20, 1959).

Dr. Freeman views the education problem as principally one of discovering ways of getting better education for the same money, eliminating waste and frills. He debunks the expensive "small class" concept and urges weeding out the curricula, as well as lifting standards of instruction.

Actually, Dr. Freeman's point of view and that of the President's Science Advisory Committee happen to be in general agreement with the analysis presented by Beardsley Ruml (usually classed as a "liberal") in his current booklet, *Memo to a College Trustee*, (McGraw-Hill $1). Ruml, referring to higher education, says that "new money is not needed in anything like the amounts presently estimated. Many of the necessary funds are already at the disposal of the college, but are being dissipated through wastes in the curriculum, and in methods of instruction." Ruml blames the college trustees for letting extravagant minded faculties get out of hand.

Hoffa and Reuther: More than meets the eye lies in the terrific vehemence of labor boss Hoffa's talk about pulling a general strike.

In Washington, those who have made a study of Hoffa's career and tactics believe that the ambitious labor chieftain deliberately discharged this bombshell in order to complicate the situation of his bitterest rival in the labor movement, Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers union, and master mind of the AFL-CIO.

It is anybody's guess today whether legislation to curb labor boss powers will be passed this year in Congress. But it is not beyond the realm of probability that public feeling, aroused against union abuses, may force through some laws designed to affect adversely not only Hoffa but also Reuther. Hoffa—it is believed—would settle for that; he reportedly feels that he has sufficient strength to weather any litigation. At least, he has weathered much so far. But Reuther has not yet been touched by labor reform laws; and might suffer if he were.

Thus, labor experts say, Hoffa may calculate that his own position, relative to the rest of the labor movement, might be better than that of Reuther; and that reform legislation would expand his strength further.

It is considered significant that last week Hoffa lashed out at Reuther in a personal attack, saying that the latter has "neither brains nor guts" and that Walter once dodged serving in a picket line in Detroit.

● The realities of economics—which figure little in Reuther's discourses—seem to have caught up with him. On his return from a recent trip to Germany, the Auto Workers union leader indicated he had looked into German wage costs—one factor in the brisk sale of German automobiles in the United States. Reuther now proposes that the US Government impose a payment on imported German cars, which would narrow the gap between the high wage rates in the US auto industry and the wages paid by German auto manufacturers.

No little significance is attached to this new Reuther line of thinking, for two reasons: (1) it suggests that the labor boss has awakened to the fact that American industry is pricing itself out of the market, because of higher American wage rates; and (2) while Reuther does not call his proposal for the US to impose a payment on imported cars a "tariff," it is a tariff just the same. Hitherto, Reuther and the CIO have loftily spurned tariffs and called for more and more free trade.

Capitol Camera: A unanimous "no" was voted by the school board of Fort Worth, Texas, on the question of whether to accept some $140,000 in Federal aid to education. Said the Forth Worth school superintendent: "We like the program we have very much. We think it's cheaper, and it is completely controlled on a local basis."

● Washington is still whispering about the opportunity Western diplomats fluffed at the current Geneva talks. Russia's Andrei Gromyko claimed that Czechoslovakia and Poland should be permitted full participation in the conference, since they had been the first victims of Nazi aggression. Strangely, no Western negotiator reminded Gromyko that the Soviet Union, having signed a nonaggression pact with Hitler just eight days before his attack on Poland, subsequently broke a nonaggression pact with Poland and joined the Nazi invasion which triggered off World War II.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Farm Front: Another shocking chapter is being written in the story of farm surpluses. The Washington *News* revealed last week that a National Farmers Union grain storage cooperative in Minnesota receives nearly $3.5 million in subsidies from the Government each year, and then spends approximately two-thirds of that amount to promote its demands for more.

The National Farmers Union is an extremely far left organization which opposes the conservative American Farm Bureau at nearly every turn. A long-time ally of labor boss Walter Reuther, NFU has been influential in sending "liberals" to Washington. In a famous speech delivered September 7, 1950, Senator Styles Bridges (R.-N.H.) charged that "the Farmers Union so consistently espouses Communist causes, parrots Communist propaganda, and refuses to denounce Communists for their activities as to preclude the possibility of accident or coincidence."

According to the *News'* account, NFU's Grain Terminal Association was paid $3.3 million in 1958 for storing surplus grain taken over by the Federal Government in its farm price support program.

From the profits of its business, GTA lays out an estimated $2 million annually to underwrite propaganda campaigns for higher price supports, more farm spending, and the election of sympathetic politicians.

Paid outlets for GTA's demands include a 14-station television network, radio stations, a weekly newspaper, magazines and pamphlets. Through these outlets, the co-op labels proponents of high, rigid price supports as "courageous" and "forthright." Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, for his efforts to remove Government controls over farmers, is called a "dictator" bent on "rule or ruin."

The *News* reported that the general manager of the Grain Terminal Association "is able to boast that he controls the farm votes of every Congressman from the upper mid-West, except Representative Walter Judd (R.-Minn.)."

Last year the Terminal Association grossed earnings of $12.1 million, about 25 per cent of which came from the Government. GTA's net earnings totaled $3.7 million, on which—under its cooperative status—it paid only $617,000 in total taxes. A private corporation, realizing comparable net earnings, would have paid nearly $2 million in taxes to the Federal Government alone.

● On the plus side of the farm surplus story comes this item from *The Wall Street Journal*:

"While US lawmakers and Federal planners cast about for ways to reduce towering agricultural surpluses, a growing number of American farmers are trying this tack: personal hawking of their wares abroad."

During the past few months, farmers from a number of states have been traveling to Europe and South America, at their own expense and with nothing directly to gain, in order to promote sales to reduce the Government's spiraling stockpile of excess crops.

"Thus far," observes the *Journal*, "the globe-trotting farmers can report no startling successes, though they have scored some gains from their personal contacts . . . . But the push abroad by farmers themselves is news, for it's a sharp break with the past when most farmers promptly forgot about a crop after it was harvested."

The Untold Dulles Story: The prodigious volume of praise poured over the bier of John Foster Dulles presented a phenomenon which fascinated observers in the Capital. For most of the encomiums were issued from the mouths of those who long and vainly sought to "bury" (to use Khrushchev's word) Dulles politically and none related the real Dulles story. Many of these post-mortem admirers—it is asserted—tried only to keep their names in print in the mass tribute to a man who actually, and not merely professedly, fought an effective war against the world Communist strategy.

From the beginning of his ventures in foreign policy, Dulles showed himself to be a realist. Back in 1939, in private law practice, Dulles looked abroad at the gathering storm and at home at the rising demands for the US to intervene, and said: "Only hysteria entertains the idea that Germany, Italy or Japan contemplates war against us. . . . I see no justification for our participation in the senseless cyclical struggle which, under our present world system, always goes on between static and dynamic forces." A year later Dulles was privately giving aid and assistance to the America First organization of General Robert E. Wood, which opposed intervention in the world struggle.

Although an internationalist by background and upbringing, Dulles remained a realist. In 1952, despite the fact that his political links had been with Governor Dewey, Dulles came to terms with Senator Taft, when the latter made his strongest bid for the GOP Presidential nomination. Before the convention, he worked out a foreign policy plank with Taft in private conference. Friends of Taft say that the Ohioan decided that, if he won the nomination and election, he would make Dulles Secretary of State.

Once President Eisenhower gave him the job in 1953, Dulles shrewdly assumed the foremost task of making himself, in fact as well as in name, the director of foreign policy. He had no illusions of the difficulty.

The bitter experience of his uncle, Robert Lansing, as Secretary of State under Woodrow Wilson (1915-20), left its impress on Dulles—say friends of the late Secretary. Lansing was bypassed in important matters by the famous Colonel E. M. House, Wilson's unofficial brain truster on foreign affairs. House had the key to the back door of the White House; Dulles realized that too many had such access to Ike.

He eventually solved the problem—after many difficulties—by patiently earning Ike's esteem and full support. But meanwhile, he had to struggle against ideas emanating from such backdoor sources as Milton Eisenhower, John J. McCloy of Chase Bank, Paul Hoffman and Harold Stassen. The latter temporarily won a foothold in the White House and in the State Department, from which spots he worked for appeasement and against Dulles' positive anti-Communist policies. But Dulles won in the end, with Harold retiring to local politics.

Other roadblocks in Dulles' path were Sherman Adams, the President's evil genius, and Henry Cabot Lodge, now Ambassador to the UN. In 1952-53, Lodge sought

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to dissuade Ike from naming Dulles Secretary of State. Against this legion of adversaries, Dulles had to compromise, twist, turn, hedge, procrastinate, and bide his time, *etc.*—in his quest for Ike's trust. This complicated task helps to explain some stands of Dulles, disliked by the right wingers, such as his final opposition to the Bricker Amendment (which he really favored, say friends). Dulles' greatest diplomatic victory—so observe many insiders—was his achievement in winning over Ike to his major foreign policy: no surrender to Soviet aggression.

Having accomplished the preliminary missionary work with Ike, Dulles was able to inflict historic defeats on the global Soviet forces, although few of the funeral orators last week made the point. Thus, late in 1957, he rattled the saber, threatened Soviet Russia with swift atomic retaliation if the latter, then trying to bulldoze Turkey, acted against our ally. Before this "brinkmanship" Moscow backed down—although Senator Humphrey and his ilk have never acknowledged that Dulles won the rubber.

Again, last fall, while American appeasers urged retreat, Dulles stood fast on the Quemoy and Matsu crisis, when Chinese Reds sought to batter down these outposts of the free world. Having three years previously won Ike's assent to such a position, Dulles persevered—and again the Chinese Reds backed down. Silence by the "liberal" press also greeted this success which confirmed the soundness of the Dulles policy.

Finally, as he became physically weakened by cancer, Dulles waged a last ditch effort to prevent the summit conference, which he feared. If death had not cut him down, he might have succeeded.

Subversion: A warning that America faces a new and serious challenge from Communist infiltration has been issued by the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

On a recent television and radio interview, conducted by Senator George Smathers (D.-Fla.), J. Edgar Hoover reported that the National Committee of the Communist party has been briefed by three of its high officials who recently returned from an important Moscow conference.

Reversing a reported downward trend in party membership brought about by the late Senator Joseph McCarthy's crusade, Hoover said that "they [the Communists] have now renewed their drive for increased membership."

Asked by Senator Smathers how America can best combat communism, Hoover replied:

"I think the best way to combat it is to have our people know what communism is. There's a great confusion as to what its real purposes are. We read in the paper some of the statements made by Khrushchev and his associates, pleading for peaceful coexistence. What that means is surrender to communism.

"They also talk about the necessity of our foreign policy being more flexible. I think our people should recognize the fact that you can't be flexible with principles. And our principle of foreign policy was based on morality. I think the young people of the country should have that brought to their attention in the schools and in the colleges of the country so that they can be informed when they go out and become voters in the next generation."

A-Test Ban: A member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy is outspoken in his belief that the US should stand clear of any nuclear test ban agreements with the Soviets.

Watching with concern the test ban talks underway in Geneva, Representative Craig Hosmer (R.-Calif.) stated recently: "A nuclear test ban would not constitute a step toward disarmament nor materially lessen the danger of nuclear war. It could lead directly to a tremendous overbalance of nuclear power in Communist hands for use against the West."

Congressman Hosmer protested that the State Department has in its possession classified reports revealing methods by which atomic explosions can take place without detection from long range. He said that the release of these secret reports to the public would clear up general confusion regarding the feasibility of the test ban now being considered by the US, Great Britain, and Russia.

"Merely banning such tests applies no brake whatever on the building of arsenals of nuclear weapons," Hosmer stated. Citing the Russians' 40-year record of treaty breaking, Hosmer contended that even if the system of detecting tests becomes foolproof, the US should not restrict its own nuclear war potential.

"Unless its past actions are to be disregarded, the objective of the Communist bloc is one Communist world," the California legislator warned. "Nothing stands in the way of accomplishing that objective except Russian reluctance to pay the price of a nuclear war. This realism explains their great efforts to paralyze the West's ability to use nuclear weapons."

Father's Day Gift: What better gift than *The Herbert Hoover Story*, by Eugene Lyons? Regular price, $5.90. Prepublication price, $4.90. Order from HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D.C. Delivery by Father's Day cannot be guaranteed in all cases, so give your father a card saying this wonderful gift is on the way.

MAJOR GENERAL EDWIN A. WALKER, US Army Military District, Little Rock, Ark.: "I am a thorough supporter of your publication, and must say that it has tremendous value in these difficult times."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). **Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.**

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*
JOHN R. BENEDICT, *Assistant Editor* NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, *Assistant Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 22 HUMAN EVENTS June 3, 1959

Article Section I

The Federal Bureaucracy

The Fourth Branch of Government

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

By JAMES BURNHAM

This article is condensed from a chapter of *Congress and the American Tradition*, by James Burnham, published by the Regnery Company ($6.50, 363 pages)

IN OUR DAY only the very naive can suppose the civil bureaucracy, with its base peacetime number nearly 3,000,000, supported most of the time by the socially similar military bureaucracy, to be a mere agent of the President, meticulously obeying the orders of his appointive officials under the laws passed by Congress. The bureaucracy, like the Carolingian Mayors of the Palace in eighth-century France, not merely wields its own share of sovereign power but begins to challenge the older branches for supremacy.

This emergence of the bureaucracy is a creeping growth, expressed most tellingly in the day to day, unpublicized activities of the governmental colossus, though on occasion it is more openly marked. What most plainly reveals the independent power of the bureaucracy are those cases where the bureaucrats of some department, agency or office persist in a policy that is contrary to the policy held by both Congress and the President.

Under such circumstances—which are not at all unusual—it is obviously an illusion to believe that the civil servants are in reality subject to the "policy-making" appointive official who is their nominal superior, or to the laws that have been enacted by Congress. In a process well known to modern Washington, the official, who may be the Secretary or Assistant Secretary of one of the major departments, becomes the dupe or tool or front of the permanent civil servants whom he is assigned to direct.

For example, many of the permanent officers of the Public Health Service have long favored an expansion of the Government's role in the field of medicine, and both inside and outside the governmental apparatus have advocated measures that, in practical effect, move toward the progressive socialization of medicine. This is natural enough from the standpoint of their own jobs and interests. Moving on the inside track, their power and influence necessarily increase with every advance in a statist direction.* Probably few of the permanent officers are doctrinaire Socialists; but most of them tend much closer to a medical socialism, or statism, than either the President, their appointive policy-making superiors, or Congress.

A similar pattern of relations is observable in Government offices dealing with education, social insurance, agriculture, electric power and housing, and from the same organic cause. It is often forgotten that governmental "social insurance," for example, whatever its objective merits, is ineluctably bound up with the incomes and careers of tens of thousands of lesser and greater bureaucrats who administer it; and, more generally, the livelihood, power and prestige of the members of the permanent bureaucracy are bound up with the state.

ONCE THE BUREAUCRACY has grown beyond the limits within which personal acquaintance and inspection can fairly well comprehend it, once it has taken on an institutional life of its own, an average bureaucrat (whatever he may say in public for discretion's sake) cannot be expected to support measures that would lead to the decrease of Government's funds, functions and personnel. An exceptional individual strongly indoctrinated in anti-statist ideology or carefully watched by an anti-statist superior might do so, but for the bureaucrat to advocate anti-statism is equivalent to asking for his economic throat to be

* The well-known bureaucratic phenomenon of "empire building" arises not from accidents of individual psychology but out of the inner imperatives of the bureaucratic situation.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cut. Thus the huge modern bureaucracy is both a product of statist tendencies and simultaneously a cause of the persistence of those tendencies.

The independent policy of the bureaucracy is manifest in connection not only with the general issue of statism but with a multitude of other problems as well, some of them minor and accidental, perhaps springing from no more complex cause than the ingrained ideas of a long-lasting individual bureaucrat or a particular bureau's fossilized work habits. It has been evident for some years that the permanent staff of the State Department, especially the career officers of the Foreign Service, have—besides their technical abilities—policy ideas of their own that do not readily yield to the directives of the President and the appointive heads of the department, and that are still further removed from the notions that Congressmen try to incorporate in laws.

The independent power of the foreign affairs bureaucracy is so widely recognized that it has given birth to a special term ("Indians") to designate the bureaucratic assistants to the appointive "policy-makers." Some high officials have in part attributed to these juniors the "force of inertia" that unduly delays or leaves unconsummated the execution of Presidential policy.*

There is substantial evidence that a number of important foreign policy decisions of the past generation—on the Nazis, China, Tito, Nasser, for example—were the will of the permanent bureaucracy rather than of the President and his supposedly policy-making appointees.**

The conduct of the independent regulatory agencies—such as the National Labor Relations Board or the Federal Communications Commission, to cite two conspicuous examples—departs still more widely at times from the intent of Congress and the President.

These observations apply to the military as well as the civil bureaucracy. In theory the President, as Chief Administrator, directs the civil bureaucracy, and as Commander-in-Chief directs the military bureaucracy. In practice each escapes from his control when it becomes large, technically complex, and permanent. The two bureaucracies have both common and special interests.

In recent decades the power of the military has particularly expanded because of the increase in the size of the permanent military establishment, the immense sums of money put at its disposition, and the influence of military procurement on finance and industry. In spite of the doctrine of civilian supremacy, the influence of the military bureaucracy has come to be felt, and is sometimes decisive, not only in military and foreign affairs but in the domestic economy.*

THE EXPANDED POWER and autonomy of the bureaucracy is expressed in the symbols of personal conduct and social intercourse. Most citizens, lost in the mazes of tax or subsidy or license rules, have had immediate experience of that "bureaucratic arrogance" or insolence that the chroniclers of other bureaucratized societies have often described.

All who have had business to do at the Nation's Capital will have discovered how long and perilous is the path to the desk of a high-ranking official of a department or agency office, and how small a chance there is that one's troubles will be promptly adjusted when he finally scales the last precipice. It is far easier, as anyone may readily confirm for himself, to get to talk with a member of Congress than with a bureaucrat of the middle or higher grades.

* Arthur Krock in the *New York Times*, Dec. 14, 1956.

** The curious procedure usually employed in recent years to arrive at policy decisions automatically increases the weight of the bureaucracy. An outsider would assume that a policy-making official (or the President, if the matter were important enough) would issue a general directive, and instruct his staff to elaborate it, show how it would be implemented, *etc.* This is not what happens. The official instructs his staff to prepare *a policy* (on China, Yugoslavia, Germany or whatever) for him to adopt.

* In the *Power Elite*, Prof. C. Wright Mills contends that the upper level of the military bureaucracy is integrally linked with the managerial group in industry to constitute the Nation's now dominant stratum.

All books mentioned in HUMAN EVENTS can be obtained, at the bookstore price, from The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N. Y.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY" at $ _____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 22 HUMAN EVENTS June 1, 1959
Article Section II

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

The American Heritage

The Role of the Conservative in our National Life

By THE HON. STYLES BRIDGES

A FEW YEARS AGO, to call a man "conservative" was to smear his name. "Progressive" and "liberal"—those were the fashionable, favorable labels. Of late, however, the term "conservative" has once more attained some measure of general respectability and social acceptability. At least we conservatives are finding more and more people willing to give us a forum to express our views.

Well, what does a conservative in the United States believe?

He strongly believes in the system of government established in the beginning of this Republic. In plain words, he is a man who takes the Constitution seriously. A conservative believes in the principle of federalism. He agrees with Abraham Lincoln that "the union must and shall be preserved." He disagrees with those favoring centralized government —such as the Fascists, Communists, and Socialists —because under it the people lose their freedom.

Another principle in which the conservative believes is that of inalienable rights—the right of life, liberty, self-determination and the pursuit of happiness.

Let it never be forgotten that it was a group of conservative statesmen who added the Bill of Rights to our Constitution.

The conservative seeks always to encourage local government to solve local problems. The fundamental business of government is to increase the capacity of citizens to make their own way. This is the classic liberal position. It is, in my view, the position of the modern American conservative.

It contrasts sharply with the authoritarian ideas of government held by some in our society today who call themselves "liberals." Many of these people have no faith in the ability of citizens to make their way in life and chart their own destiny—on their own or through local and state governmental action.

Conservatives believe true progress is evolutionary, not revolutionary. Conservatives learn the lessons of the past—modern as well as ancient—and apply them to the present.

But too many of today's "liberals" choose to ignore the truisms of history, regarding such warnings as roadblocks to the path of their pell-mell rush toward so-called progress.

Some modern "liberals" want to impose conformity of thought and behavior on all of us. First, they would set up a world government. Then they would force all the peoples of the world to knuckle down to one set of laws, one set of customs, one way of life—all in the naive expectation that American laws, American justice, American customs would prevail.

Conservatives would never agree to yield our hard-won rights and liberties to a supergovernment in which America might be outnumbered, outvoted, and outcast.

Today's "liberals" pose as great benefactors of mankind. Yet, they always choose central government as the vehicle to dispense so-called free benefits to the people.

It was no conservative who proposed to draft striking American workers into the Army. It was no conservative who threatened to slaughter cattle on farms to enforce price controls and meat rationing. It was no conservative who seized private property illegally. (This was done by former President Truman who took over privately owned steel mills under his astonishing doctrine of inherent powers of the President.) It was no conservative who planted microphones in jury rooms in Wichita, Kansas, to eavesdrop on their secret deliberations.

Unlike many "liberals" today, conservatives do not believe Government spending is, in itself, the key to prosperity and economic security. Conservatives know excessive Government spending—and the high taxes which must go with it—is repressive both of freedom in the economy and of liberty for the individual.

Conservatives firmly believe the Government must make every effort to keep its books in balance and meet its obligations as they fall due. This is not just a bookkeeping exercise. It is the way of keeping the value of the dollar intact.

Maintaining the buying power of our currency is one of the finest ways to do the most good for the greatest number.

OF COURSE, one of the greatest hoaxes of the ages is the claim that Government benefits are free. The island of Britain found this out during the Great Experiment under the Labor party when cradle-to-grave Government benefits were inaugurated. The British people soon found they were saddled with very high taxes to pay for these "free" benefits. All of Britain labored under rationing, controls, shortages, high prices.

Capitalist America was called upon to bail out

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain on several occasions. Not until the Conservative Government came into office did Britain begin to share in world prosperity.

Another area where there is a vast chasm between the conservative and the so-called "liberal" position is in resource development. The total job of developing our national resources to meet the needs of our growing economy staggers the imagination. It is unrealistic to argue the Federal Government *alone* should finance and manage these tremendous undertakings.

Yet, this is what certain highly vocal elements—among them some self-styled "liberals"—in reality are advocating. But the facts show that the Pacific Northwest and the Tennessee Valley are the only two areas in the entire United States where power reserves are below normal and where power shortages are impending.

In both of these areas the Federal Government has been the dominating figure for the last quarter of a century!

Some "liberals" even proclaim the TVA-private power battle as the never-ending struggle between democracy and special privilege. They are fond of citing TVA as the yardstick against which people in all states can measure private power rates and monopolistic practices.

Actually, TVA is a yardstick to measure how nice it would be to do business without having to pay taxes, interest, or other return on the investment.

Talk about special privilege! Never was *privilege* so *special!*

TVA pays no interest or dividends on the taxpayers' investment in it. It pays no corporation taxes to the Federal Government as private corporations must do. It pays no taxes to local governments, except some token payments in lieu of taxes. It doesn't even pay taxes on the transportation of the vast quantity of coal shipped to its steam power plants.

Today's "liberals" hail Abraham Lincoln for defying the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case. On the other hand, they defame anybody who dares to differ with the Supreme Court in *our* time.

Certain modern "liberals" never stop calling for flexibility on the part of the United States in foreign policy. They would yield Quemoy and Matsu—freedom outposts in the Pacific—to the Reds. Yet they profess to stand firm on Berlin—a freedom outpost in Europe.

Contemporary "liberals" say they favor the private enterprise system, but at heart some of them prefer socialism. It is the privilege of anyone to believe in socialism. However, we must recognize that anybody who does puts himself in pretty sorry company.

In an official pamphlet, dated April, 1954, the American Communist party stated:

"The Communist party, basing itself on the scientific principles of Marxism-Leninism, believes in *socialism* as the ultimate solution for the problems of our Nation."

Someone once said socialism will work only in two places: heaven (where they don't need it) and hell (where they've already got it).

The appeal of too many modern "liberals" is to the inherent laziness of man. When he can get more from Government handouts than by the sweat of his brow, man will sit back and wait for the postman to deliver his check.

The conservative says that, given sufficient incentive, man will exert himself to improve his lot on earth; and that along with incentive must go equality of opportunity, equal justice under law, and basic rights and freedoms such as we enjoy under our Constitution.

Freedom is magnetic. Its magnetism penetrates the Iron Curtain to attract peoples away from slavery under their Communist masters.

FROM HUNGARY 200,000 people fled oppression following the unsuccessful people's revolt in 1956. Three million persons have escaped tyranny in East Germany to breathe freedom's air in the West. Another three million abandoned Communist North Korea to seek refuge in free South Korea, and one million left Communist North Viet Nam to settle in free South Viet Nam.

Why should these people have been unhappy? They were fed, clothed, and sheltered by the Government. They all had jobs—there were no unemployment worries. And they all had equality.

That was just the trouble. They were all equals—all abject slaves to the ruling Communists.

No wonder the movement away from Communist countries continues. The brave souls who risk their lives to get out are not searching for cradle-to-grave security. On the contrary, they are running away from it. What they seek is the chance to live their own lives with their families, to earn their own living at a vocation of their choice, to worship as they please—in a word, to live in dignity and self-respect as free men.

Styles Bridges, one of the foremost conservatives in public life today, is serving his fourth term as US Senator from New Hampshire. This article is an abridgement of an address recently made by Senator Bridges at Pennsylvania State University.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ *reprints of "THE AMERICAN HERITAGE"* at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED